ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED002673	N.A.	2843

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Ivins, Wilson

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Team Teaching in Southwestern Secondary Schools

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: NASSP Bulletin

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN: ORG. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, ST. New Mexico; CITY, STATE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	27-31	3/64	5

TELE. EXT. INST/LOC CODE

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☒ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☐ FINAL ☒ FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

team teaching	grouping
secondary education	instructional technology
instructional aids	teaching methods
	southwest

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

A report of a survey-study on team teaching procedures in public secondary schools in Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico is presented. Current practices were evaluated when there was evidence of a general agreement or disagreement with commonly accepted principles of secondary education.

A poll of 440 schools enrolling more than 150 students showed that 105 of the schools were using or had used team teaching. Principals of these schools were asked to complete a checklist; there were eighty-eight respondents.

The major findings included: at least one-fourth of all secondary schools in the area enrolling 150 or more students had used or were using team teaching; there was no agreement on a single definition of team teaching; the primary objectives of team teaching were better use of teachers and improvement of educational quality; most teaching teams were in the basic subjects; the organization of team teaching was usually informal; student grouping was used in only a minority of the schools; the schools used a wide variety and good supply of instructional aids; the schools had adequate or barely adequate facilities for large and small group instruction; and there had been little systematic effort to compare the achievement of students under team teaching with those under conventional teaching methods. Reactions of principals toward team teaching ranged from indifference to enthusiasm.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

207-070 O - 66 - 23

Vol. 48-290

basis according to ability. The teaching team might arrange some instruction in basic skills by groups determined for this purpose according to status in the skills concerned.

Personnel arrangements might include:

1. A principal whose major duties involve the coordination of basic instructional units and special instructional centers, and leadership in curriculum planning and evaluation activities.
2. An assistant principal (assuming 500 or more pupils) to manage supporting administrative and auxiliary school services and to supervise record-keeping, clerical, and fiscal operations.
3. Special staff positions: curriculum research and evaluation, psychological services, health services, etc.
4. Classification of teachers as either (1) homeroom or (2) special center, there being no differential in status or salary due to this classification.
5. Homeroom teachers would work with pupils about two-thirds of their scheduled time and have one-third available for team planning, individual preparation, and parent conferences. Special center teachers would have an appropriate period available daily for individual preparation and conferences with teaching team members.
6. Employment and assignment of faculty based on:
   - Five to six years' college training and three or more years' successful teaching experience before permanent license.
   - For all teachers a major in their teaching field (s) through the Master's degree, with adequate professional education of a practice-oriented nature.
   - Equivalent of a doctorate in the field of specialization for all administrative and special staff positions.
   - Salary schedule provisions for recognition of superior training and performance.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ED002673

Team Teaching in Southwestern Secondary Schools

ED002673

WILSON IVINS

RECENTLY the writer completed a survey-study (soon to be published in its entirety) of team teaching procedures in public secondary schools enrolling 150 or more students in Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico.[1] The report that follows presents selected portions of the complete study.

The primary purpose of this study was to report current practices rather than to evaluate or judge those practices. However, if strong evidences of consensus in practice, internal discrepancies, and either agreement or disagreement between observed practices and commonly accepted principles of education were to become evident, the study was then to assume the secondary purpose of appraising them. Within these limits, the more specific purposes of this study were: (1) to ascertain from principals which schools are or have been using some form of team teaching, how they define it, what objectives they claim for it, what their practices are, what values they place upon the practices, and what difficulties and problems they encounter; (2) to attempt to draw generalizations about the practices of team teaching in these schools; and (3) to evaluate these generalizations with reference to commonly accepted principles of secondary education.

Some other specific questions clearly implied in these purposes include: (1) What organizational procedures do the schools in the study follow? (2) What instructional methods are

[1] The entire study is available from The New Mexico Cooperative Research and Study Council, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

Wilson Ivins is Chairman, Department of Secondary Education, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY - U.S.C.
2843
JUN 15 '65

ED002673

in common use? (3) How is team teaching scheduled? (4) To what extent are students grouped in the team teaching programs? (5) What use of aids to instruction is in evidence? (6) What is the nature and quality of the physical facilities available for team teaching? (7) How do the principals of the schools studied evaluate the results of team teaching in their schools?

The Sample

Principals of 440 public secondary schools in Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico of greater than 150 student enrollment were first polled to ascertain how many were or had been engaged in team teaching. Responses were secured from schools, of which 4 proved to be elementary schools; 105 indicated that they were using or had been using team teaching. (Four schools included in these results had employed team teaching in previous years but not during the year of the study.)

Principals of the 105 schools were then asked to agree to complete a checklist for further study of the team teaching procedures in their schools, and 104 agreed to do so. Eighty-eight of these 104 actually did complete the checklist and return it for analysis and study.

Major Findings

Space does not permit a detailed presentation of the data. But, from his analysis of those data, the writer believes that the following conclusions are warranted and applicable to public secondary schools of more than 150 students in the states of Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico. To whatever extent the sampled schools are representative of other secondary schools, these conclusions could be extended and applied to them.

1. At least one-fourth of all public secondary schools of 150 or more students in the study area are or have been engaged in some form of a new teaching procedure which their principals recognize as "team teaching." *Probably* as many as one-third of such schools are actually making use of team teaching.

2. Principals (and, by extension, their staffs) do *not* agree upon a single definition of team teaching. Detailed descriptions

of several aspects of definitions, reveal that they do generally agree that team teaching is a procedure requiring the services of two or more teachers teaching cooperatively in a single teaching situation. A majority of them agree, furthermore, that this cooperative teaching brings to the student a more effective, more diversified teaching service than would a conventional teaching program. At the same time, the responses show that many principals have little awareness of or desire to use some of the more elaborate forms of teaching teams that have been proposed. For example, the kind of team that includes a hierarchical arrangement of teachers and aides of varying status, experience, skills, and responsibilities is represented in less than ten per cent of the schools employing team teaching. A well defined, commonly accepted concept of the "teaching team" has not yet emerged. (Whether or not it will or should emerge is, of course, an arguable question.) If one hears that a school is using team teaching, he will be wise to visit the school and "see for himself" if he wishes to be sure of anything more than that two or more teachers are acting together, cooperatively, as they teach a single large class.

3. There is no unanimous agreement about the relative significance of the various objectives sought by the schools in their use of team teaching; but there is ample evidence to indicate that *among* the primary objectives are the more effective use of skilled teachers and improvement of the quality of instruction. Given the scarcity of teachers and of money and the abundance of students, the overwhelming tendency of principals to rank these objectives high at the same time that they almost unanimously rank lowest (if they do not ignore) such objectives as saving money can only be commended.

The tendency of some principals to rank high the objective of helping beginning teachers acquire professional skill through association with veterans is understandable. The odd fact is that larger numbers of principals ignore this apparently sound objective, the accomplishment of which could contribute so much both to the novice teacher and—ultimately—the students.

In general, responses of principals tended to explode the belief expressed by a few critics of team teaching (and of similar

staff utilization procedures) that the primary interest is in saving dollars and getting more out of already overworked teaching staffs. Without denying the possibility of economics and other practical outcomes, the responses emphasized a primary regard for the welfare of the learners.

4. The safest conclusion concerning practices in team teaching is that few, indeed, have found general acceptance. Equally significant, however, may be the few practices which have found general acceptance. In general, the findings do indicate that a picture of commonly accepted practices is *emerging*. Enough principals described a group of practices to make it perfectly clear that there has been considerable movement toward common acceptance.

Typically, even schools of 1,000 students had only one teaching team, and that was in the area of English (language arts), social studies, or science. Obviously these are the subject areas with the most students, in which one is most likely to find sufficient numbers of capable and interested teacher prospects for the team. Although teams are being used in many fields, in a casual visit one should not *expect* to see a team in other than basic subjects.

Perhaps the next most significant conclusion one can reach about organization and procedures in team teaching is that they tend to be tentative, informal, and relatively undeveloped. There was more than a suggestion in the comments of the principals that most of the programs are very new, hence subject to further development. As has already been pointed out, the responses of many principals indicated their possible lack of awareness of proposed practices and procedures that might greatly strengthen their programs. In such instances the analysis was hard put to resist temptation to suggest (as professors always do!) that courses or workshops should be offered to principals. (Probably this temptation *should* have been resisted as it *was*. Long experience has shown how erroneous this kind of inference and how ineffective this kind of proposed solution can be.)

On the whole, the responses of principals to sections of the checklist dealing with practices and procedures suggested

(especially when each checklist was studied by itself) that principals and teaching teams knew what they had been doing, chose to do it because they thought that was best in their situation, and had a good chance to move forward in developing their own most effective programs.

5. In methodology and the use of aids to instruction there was little evidence of greater variety than one would find in a conventional instructional program. This was disappointing. Here in a new, if not actually experimental, program one might well expect to discover frequent use of off-beat and unusual methods and devices. Yet few of the principals reported the use of programing or television, for example, and not one method or procedure that would be unfamiliar to a merely casual reader of any standard text in educational methods was reported by any of the principals! Certainly encouragement of these principals and their teams to "live dangerously and do something different" would seem to be in order.

Especially disappointing (and confusing) was the fact that many principals reported that their "large" groups were no larger than regular classes—and met just as often; and that their "small" groups were no smaller than regular classes—and met just as often. In the face of the opportunity to meet students in both larger-than-usual and smaller-than-usual groups on a flexible schedule, this finding was hard to explain or justify.

6. Responses of principals to checklist items about student grouping revealed that in a small minority of the schools there is no attempt to produce grouping of students beyond that achieved by the intrinsic characteristics of the comprehensive high school. However, the proportion of schools using grouping is large. Perhaps, by comparison with the situation of twenty years ago, there is evidence of a trend in the direction of grouping.

There was in the responses no more conclusive evidence to support grouping than one ordinarily finds in similar inquiries into the subject. As in most surveys of grouping practices, the findings were inconclusive about the merits and strengths of the practices.

7. Principals' responses made it clear that schools have access to a wide variety and good supply of aids to instruction. The typical school is using frequently and in a variety of ways all of the standard aids except programing and television. The newness of programing and technical problems in the effective use of television may explain these exceptions to the general finding.

8. Typically the schools have "adequate" or "barely adequate" facilities for large group instruction, small group instruction, individual study, staff planning, and conferences between teacher and parent or teacher and student. Principals indicated greatest need for large-group meeting spaces; at the same time, however, they recognized that most often individual study spaces were the facilities that were deficient. A small number of principals indicated that their new schools had been planned specifically for team teaching. Certainly in those schools team teaching will not be quickly dropped.

9. Undoubtedly the most discouraging single conclusion of the study is this: Only few more than a third of the principals reported any systematic effort to compare student achievement in team teaching and conventional teaching on a pre-test, post-test basis. To be sure, such efforts to appraise results would not, in themselves, tell a complete story. Yet it is hard to understand how a school could try out this new approach to teaching without some such effort.

On the brighter side, other responses to checklist items showed that principals have thought about the effectiveness of team teaching in their schools and tried to judge it by less systematic means. Furthermore, their responses clearly indicate their belief that, at worst, the reaction of all who have been concerned with team teaching (teachers, counselors, administrators, parents, students) is one of indifference. At best (and much more frequently) the reaction has been enthusiastic belief in present values and potential gains in team teaching. Certainly nothing in this group of responses would cause a schoolman to back away from team teaching or pause in his approach to it as a hope for the future.

Democratic Administrative Behavior

RONALD L. LIEN

THIS is a brief report of a study conducted during 1961-62 under the auspices of the University of North Dakota. Its purpose was to determine the extent to which certain characteristic democratic administrative behaviors were exhibited by public secondary-school principals in the Upper Midwest states of Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The sample included principals in these states who served schools with enrollment of 350 or more and who devoted full or nearly full time to administration. Principals whose duties included teaching more than one class were excluded.

From among this group, three hundred randomly selected principals were invited to participate. Two hundred and five of them consented and met all criteria set to qualify for inclusion in the study. Each was asked to supply the names of his faculty. From each faculty three staff members were randomly selected to evaluate the principal, and a questionnaire was sent to them. Eighty-eight per cent of these teachers completed and returned the evaluation questionnaires sent to them.

No attempt was made to determine the total effectiveness of the principals in accomplishing educational objectives. Neither was any attempt made to classify individual principals as democratic or autocratic, to label them by any other descriptive term, or to evaluate them in any way as individuals. The study dealt only with certain trends among principals as a group, or by groups.

Ronald L. Lien is Associate Professor of Education, Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota.